DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 326 CS 504 518

AUTHOR Shaw, Mark R.; Caplette, Michele
TITLE Preparing the Communication Specialist: Some Implications of an Ongoing "Train the Trainer" Program in One Industry.
PUB DATE 11 Nov 83
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (69th, Washington, DC, November 10-13, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; Conflict Resolution; *Inplant Programs; *Interpersonal Communication; Interpersonal Competence; Interprofessional Relationship; *Management Development; *Organizational Communication; Program Evaluation; *Trainers; Training Methods

ABSTRACT

Interviews with six managers trained to teach the Interpersonal Managing Skills (IMS) program at the Lockheed Missiles and Space Company provided insights into three aspects of communication training programs: training skills, the trainer role, and methods of training the trainer. A highly structured, packaged program, IMS teaches five communication skills: crediting or providing positive feedback, clarifying and confirming ideas before making decisions, providing constructive criticism, building or adding value to an idea, and managing differences of opinions. Being so highly structured, the program is largely instructor independent, yet IMS relies on both trained managers and dedicated trainers, or communication specialists, to present the course. The managers lend the program credibility while the dedicated trainers are able to handle difficult or less structured situations. During a Train-the-Trainer session, managers practice the trainer role and responsibilities through such activities as giving orientation speeches, administering learning modules, and responding to hypothetical student complaints. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED239326

PREPARING THE COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST:

SOME IMPLICATIONS OF AN ONGOING 'TRAIN THE TRAINER' PROGRAM IN ONE INDUSTRY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark R. Shaw

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mark R. Shaw

Michele Caplette

Professional Development Programs
Lockheed Missiles and Space Company
O/27-33; B/560
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Presented at the Speech Communication Association National Convention in Washington, D.C., November 11, 1983.

CS 504 518

INTRODUCTION

Applying communication skills in the "real world" can seem attractive to those of us unable or unwilling to pursue academic careers. For the most part, the pay is better and the demand seems to be growing. When you compare the opportunities of industry to the shrinking demand for teachers, it is not surprising to see students in academic departments such as communication consider nonteaching careers.

> In the past, most students receiving an undergraduate degree in speech communication went to graduate school or became elementary or secondary teachers. Given the depressed market for teachers, however, not all of those undergraduates majoring in speech communication can have a career at any level of academia.[1]

In response to their uncertain academic future, many students are discovering ways of applying their academic education, be it speech, sociology, english, psychology, etc., to industry. They are finding that a career in industry differs from a career in the university. Their experiences raises some interesting questions for educators to address.

On this panel we consider ways that Communication Departments prepare students as trainers in industry. We hope to contribute to this panel by describing a training program in one company, the Lockheed Missiles and Space Company. Based on our experiences at Lockheed we conclude that communication

training is important. But we also discovered that the most successful communication program was one that did not need a communication specialist to teach. We believe that a description of this program and the way it is used will both encourage and discourage people interested in applying their communication backgrounds to industry training; we will discuss the communication skills looked for in training programs, the contributions trainers made to the programs, and how nonprofessional trainers were prepared to train.

BACKGROUND

The Lockheed Missiles and Space Company is a subsidiary of Lockheed Corporation. At LMSC programs are carried out by three line divisions -- the Missiles System Division, the Space System Division, and the Advanced System Division. Products and profits are made here. Lockheed's most important customer is the government. Primarily a defense contractor, the company makes products like the Fleet Ballistic Missile; Command, Control, Communications, Intelligence Systems; Remotely Piloted Vehicles; and Tactical Systems. The company employs approximately 24,500 people, most of whom have technical backgrounds. A company as complex as Lockheed's needs administrative support. Four divisions are responsible for supporting the line organizations: Information Services, Finance, Operations, and Human Resources.

For the past 14 months we have administered a communication skills program for managers in all divisions at LMSC. The program is called

Interpersonal Managing Skills (IMS) and is developed by Xerox Learning Systems. As administrators we have had multiple responsibilities: to implement the program to at least 200 managers a year, to ensure the integrity of the program, to develop train the trainer programs for managers selected to teach the IMS program, and to certify new trainers.

The conclusions we make in this paper are based on interviews we conducted with 6 managers trained to teach the IMS program to other managers. We questioned them about their experiences as trainers, the contributions they made to the training session, and the skills they need to be effective. In the remainder of this paper in three sections we describe the IMS program and its implications to the communication specialist:

1. Training Skills
2. The Trainer Role
3. Training the Trainer

TRAINING SKILLS

Last year Lockheed established a company objective to train 200 managers in the IMS program. Including the materials, the rental of the off-site training facilities, and other incidentals, this training program costs nearly $250,000. This kind of financial investment indicates a clear commitment to the communication skills taught in the IMS program.

What are these communication skills? They are very much like those taught to undergraduates in Speech Communication departments. The five skills are crediting, clarifying and confirming, constructive criticism, building, and managing differences.

Crediting is a communication skill managers are taught to apply when they want to maintain the good performance of their subordinates. Basically, crediting is positive feedback. To credit effectively managers are instructed to 1) make a general reference to the performance being credited; 2) be specific in the credit; 3) identify the personal qualities that make a subordinate a high performer; and 4) demonstrate how the behavior benefits the organization.

Clarifying and confirming are skills managers should use when they initially disagree with what someone says and they have to make a decision based on the information. Clarifying and confirming is the way Xerox Learning Systems describes active listening and paraphrasing.

Constructive criticism is a skill aimed at improving an employee's performance and suggestions without stifling initiative. Managers are taught to begin a constructive criticism by itemizing first the merits and then their concerns regarding the performance to be changed. Then they engage in a dialogue both inviting and making suggestions and inviting and giving reactions. Constructive criticism and perhaps constructive feedback are commonplace in the interpersonal communication texts used in Speech

Departments.

Building is a skill managers are taught to apply when they want to add value to an idea. First they are to acknowledge the connection between the idea of the other person and their own modification to this idea. People in Speech Communication would find building skills similar to brainstorming techniques taught to them in their small group communication courses and to the principles of acknowledgement.

Managing differences is a skill managers should use when a difference exists between their own priorities or opinions and those of someone else. As a first step managers are taught to explore the difference by finding out what is important to the other person and stating what is important to themselves. The managing difference skill is a simplified version of the conflict sections in most of the interpersonal and small group communication texts found in Speech Departments.

While it is not surprising that Lockheed managers find these skills useful, we were struck by the extent to which they found the IMS training program valuable. Managers attending the workshop rated it an 8 on a scale of 10 (10 = excellent). Most significant is the 8.9 rating accorded the program's practicality and usefulness. Most of our training programs score in the 6 to 8.5 range. In addition, all managers who have attended IMS highly recommend it for all Lockheed managers.

The IMS program at Lockheed illustrates the importance of communication skills for managers. Communication skills are important, especially for technical managers trained in engineering, the sciences, or finance. But what is it about IMS that makes it so popular? There are other communication skills programs at Lockheed that are neither perceived as useful as IMS nor as successful as the IMS training program. Is it the skills or is it also how the skills are presented and packaged that contributes to the success of the program?

IMS is a tightly organized, highly structured, and well packaged program. It represents a trend in industry. Companies are purchasing high quality packaged educational programs to meet the growing emphasis on management development. A recent survey of training professionals concluded that one of the important trends to affect the training profession in the next ten years is the increased use of packaged programs.[2] In addition to IMS, Lockheed uses two other packaged programs that teach communication skills. One program, developed by the training staff at Lockheed, is called Basic Supervision Video Program (BSVP). Another was purchased from vendors Zenger/Miller. Like IMS, these programs teach interpersonal skills and they are structured to give participants practice using communications skills with minimal involvement from the trainer. What distinguishes IMS from other packaged programs used by Lockheed is its extensive structure and subsequent success.

The IMS package structures the experience for the student as well as the

trainer. From the point of view of the participants, each skill is taught in the same four steps. The first step is to acquire the skills. This is accomplished through the use of a movie showing "typical managers" modeling the skills. Students also read a programmed book on each skill and answer written questions testing their conceptual mastery.

In the next step, students practice the skills by responding to questions posed on an audio tape. In this phase of the program participants also listen to audio recordings of managers interacting with subordinates and peers. Periodically students are called upon to respond as if they were present in the unfolding interaction. Comparisons between the student answers and the modeled responses on the tape provide immediate feedback on skill use. In order to ensure that all participants stay involved, they are called upon according to random assignment.

In the third learning step, the students transfer the skills to situations that more closely approximate their own experiences. In one exercise, they are asked to discuss a case study by using the IMS skills. Later, in structured role play exercises, managers practice using the skills within the role defined for them. In the final learning step, students apply the knowledge to their own job. They are asked to fill out a "connections book" which is a private diary of how the IMS skills can be applied to the interpersonal managing situations they encounter in their jobs.

For the trainer, the program is so structured that there is little time

to do much more than push buttons for the audio and video tapes, keep track of time, and call out names for people to respond to audio response exercises. The opportunities to facilitate occur on the first day of the workshop when trainers must kick off the program; there are other opportunities to facilitate during the day when participants discuss case studies and role plays. However, the workshop day is so time driven that even during these less structured encounters, trainers have little opportunity to explore issues and ideas not anticipated by the training manual. For example one manager mentioned how the workshop structure actually impedes communication. He observed,

> There are some situations that come up in IMS that are potentially very interesting but the IMS structure would kill a good intriguing conversation.

Here we are faced with a paradox. While IMS is a communication skills program, it appears that communication skills are not actually necessary to conduct the IMS training. The effect of this structure is that the program becomes virtually instructor independent. In fact, this is one of the selling points used by the Xerox Learning Systems. Anyone can read the guidelines in the Administration Manual and run a competent training program. After training in the IMS program one manager concurred, "I could do nothing and still fulfill my role as an instructor."

In a structured program like IMS, what skills, if any, are required to fulfill the role of instructor? Some of the evaluations from IMS workshop participants point out some important qualities we should expect from professional trainers. For example, when asked about qualities of their trainers most valued during the workshop, participants responded: good observations during the role plays and discussions, good team work, preparation and knowledge, commitment to program, and keeping the program on schedule. The manager trainers were also quick to acknowledge the importance of the IMS skills in conducting IMS training. As one manager put it, "To be effective you need to know the skills." Manager trainers mentioned other communications skills they felt were important. Listening was identified by one manager as especially important, "perhaps the most important in order to relate to what's being said." Another found that presentation skills were important since a trainer spoke in front of a group. "You need to be a facilitator," added a third manager, "not a problem solver." Finally, many of the manager trainers mentioned how important it was to know "how to increase participation."

But many of the training qualities mentioned by participants and trainers had little to do with communication competence. Participants described their trainers as enthusiastic, personable, helpful, and encouraging. The manager trainers echoed these perceptions when they summarized the qualities required to be a successful IMS facilitator. They mentioned that trainers should: "care about people," "be enthusiastic," "show interest," and "be spontaneous."

Does this mean that virtually anyone can conduct an IMS workshop by walking through the Administration Manual step by step? If so, why have managers conduct the training? If IMS is already purchased as a packaged program, why are dedicated trainers involved at all? If enthusiasm and interest for IMS are perhaps more important than communication skills, then why have prospective trainers -- dedicated or not -- go through specially designed IMS Train the Trainer workshops? It is to these questions that we now turn.

THE TRAINER ROLE

The success of using either managers or trainers raises questions about the kind of skills that are necessary for trainers to possess. As we mentioned in the first section, communication skills and the style of the trainer are important. But it appeared that the success of a trainer depended upon more than the use of certain skills. What makes a trainer successful? We address this question in this section by describing the contributions managers and trainers made in the IMS sessions. The role played by managers and dedicated trainers reveal the complexity one will encounter trying to determine how to prepare trainers for industry. That complexity stems ironically from the structure of the IMS program.

As we noted, the paradox in the IMS program is that while the use of well developed communication skills may be helpful in teaching the IMS course they are not necessary. Almost anyone -- be they skilled or not -- can read the

manual and push the right buttons at the sound of the "beeps" provided by Xerox Learning Systems. To take it one step further, it is hypothetically possible to have a most highly skilled trainer conduct the IMS seminar, and have the seminar fail. By the same token it is also possible to have a person with the worst possible communication skills -- but who happens to be a senior Lockheed manager -- conduct the IMS seminar with the resulting seminar an overwhelming success. The structure of the IMS program allows managers to teach the program without having a background in communication skills. The structure frees managers from having to know the content and allows them to draw upon their experiences as managers.

In Silicon Valley, some companies use the manager as trainer because of the management experience they possess. ROLM, for example, writes in their corporate training handout,

> In most cases, ROLM line managers will serve as instructors for management development courses. This policy is based on the belief that line managers understand ROLM management better than dedicated staff instructors or "outsiders."[3]

A manager's experience gives the program credibility. As we know, credibility is an important variable in public performances of any kind. According to the interviews we conducted, the manager trainers lend credibility to the IMS program because they can draw upon their experience, display commitment to the program, and establish rapport better than the

dedicated trainers. One manager told us that "credibility is the number one advantage of having managers train" in the IMS session. In IMS, the manager trainers contributed to the credibility of the program by displaying trustworthiness, competence, and dynamism.

Trustworthiness is a dimension around which people believe what a speaker tries to tell them. How is a participant in IMS to know if the skills they are learning are worth the time and effort expended? In most training experiences, trustworthiness may be equivocal. The dedicated trainer has a stake in the training material. Of course the dedicated trainer will argue that the skills are worth the participants time and money. Whereas the manager trainer, by his or her presence, brings believability to the program. One manager mentioned for example,

> It's a good feeling for the group to have a manager as a trainer. They think that if this is a manager here training that they will get more out of the program. If the company is investing this kind of time of a manager then it must be important.

Manager trainers were also aware of enhancing the credibility of IMS through their competence. Competence is the dimension around which participants recognize trainers as experts. Many managers felt that their experience as managers made them experts in managerial communication. As several managers put it,

Managers focus on situations that are close to what other managers are concerned about. Trainers cannot know these things.

The manager can relate real life problems. He can give examples of his own.

When I am in the class, I can say to them, "Hey, I've had this experience with these skills ..." "In my day to day experience I try to use the skills in this way ..." "I've had these problems..."

In these examples, the manager identifies his or her work experience as an important contribution to the training session. That experience may help bring to life certain skills in a structured and generic program. Managers may not know as much about communication as a trainer, but they feel they know more about communicating as managers.

A final dimension of credibility displayed by managers is dynamism. Dynamism is the quality of likeableness attributed to the speaker. Personality or likeability may be the most important aspect of credibility for the trainer. In a communication program, the trainer needs to set the example that participants feel comfortable following. The extent to which managers can identify with the trainer as a model may be critical. Here again, by virtue of their position in the organization, "managers provide excellent role models," according to one manager trainer. Their dynamism is displayed in several ways. It is displayed by their rapport. One manager observed that

"Other managers listen to managers training more than they will listen to professional trainers." It is displayed by their ability to identify with the participants; Another manager found that her "class can relate more to a manager than to a trainer." Their non-professional approach to training can also display dynamism to the participants. A third manager observed that "Having a manager train, a manager who is fresh and enthusiastic and naive enough to say he's made some mistakes, has the benefit of encouraging participation by the group."

We have been arguing that the structure of the IMS program allows managers to rely on their experience during the IMS session. A benefit of structure is that it reduces the need to rely on an expert in communication or an expert in training. Managers can focus less on their substantive knowledge of training and of communication and more on their management experiences. Their credibility as trainers comes from that experience. Yet we found from our interviews that credibility was not the only reason that justifies the involvement of managers in the training program. We also found that when managers train, they not only have an opportunity to improve their relationships with others in the organization, but also learn more about the communication skills they are teaching.

Gaining exposure to a wider variety of people in the organization was an unanticipated benefit for managers teaching the IMS program. "The major advantages of having managers train is to meet people you haven't met before," concluded one manager. Adds another, "Relationships do improve when you go

through the program." When managers are involved in training they have opportunities to improve their relationships with their peers, subordinates, and people outside their departments.

Five of the six managers mentioned that their relationships with their peers improved because of training in the IMS program. As one manager put it,

> I've grown more comfortable with my associates. When I go down the hall I see usually one or two people that I know from these classes. Our relationships are better.

In addition to relationships with peers, some managers found that IMS improved their relationships with people outside their departments. One manager talked about how much closer he feels to the training organization. Another manager mentioned that by meeting people outside his work group he was able to make important contacts for getting work done in his department. In his interview he revealed that he keeps a list of people from the classes. In the Train-the-Trainer session he attended he met the employment manager and helped work out an arrangement where they could hire college students. They had hired four as a result of this conversation.

Not only do relationships improve when managers become trainers in the IMS program, but by teaching they learn more about what they teach. Training reinforced the learning.

Doing the training is like reinforcing the skills for us.

It gave you insight into the material. It's like another reinforcement, another refresher course. I missed things the first time around.

It's continual training.

In summary, the structure of the IMS program makes it possible for managers to teach the session and to be successful doing so. Because they do not have to be experts, they can bring their managerial experiences to bear on the generic lessons of the program. Moreover, the managers improve their relationships and learn more about communication skills by teaching this program. With so many advantages accumulating on the side of the manager as trainer, why not have the managers do all of the training?

The same structure that gives managers support to use their own experience paradoxically made it important for them to be accompanied by dedicated trainers. The IMS structure licensed managers to travel in training territory they would not normally undertake. The ease by which they traveled in this unfamiliar territory restricted the freedom they had to veer from the path provided by Xerox Learning Systems. The IMS program can give managers a false sense of security about the ease of training and the skills required to make training successful. Consequently, they may find themselves facing obstacles neither they nor Xerox would have ever anticipated. At these times, we can begin to appreciate the contribution dedicated trainers made even in a structured program like IMS.

Managers saw their dedicated trainer colleagues as experts in training and communication. In the less structured part of the program, managers would often defer to their training expert counterpart. One manager was particularly articulate about the competence of his trainer colleague. He stressed how she would lead the good discussions, answer the questions, and do the kick off "because she's done it so many times, she's the expert."

This manager summed up his feelings about doing training with the dedicated trainer by admitting, "I am not a professional trainer, and teachers handle questions and the class better."

Managers acknowledged that in certain situations, the dedicated trainer made important contributions to the training session. They contributed most during the less structured parts of the program -- when there were questions not anticipated by the manual, during group discussions, and during the kick off. In these situations, audio instructions were not available and the administration manual was marginally helpful. While the structure of IMS freed managers, it restricted dedicated trainers. Their years of training experience may have seemed wasted in the administration of workbooks, video dramas, audio taped conversations, and the "beeps" which cued trainers to the next portion of the lesson. Ninety percent of the time they were administrators and appeared no less or no more competent in training than their manager colleagues. But for those events that were not anticipated, dedicated trainers depended on their training experience and competence in communication. Sometimes the manager trainers found themselves in tense situations. Recalled one manager:

There are some situations in which I am unsure about how far to take it. Like when in my session one person nearly started to cry. We really got into some important things. But it seemed kind of odd to play with all the beeps at that point.

Uneasiness with situations such as those described above may be due in part to how managers see their role in the organization. Managers may be more responsible to their role as manager than their role as trainer. We see a possibility for role conflict on two occasions: 1) when managers have to be directive with their peers; and 2) when the goals of the session conflict with their goals as managers.

Sometimes managers appeared uncomfortable teaching communications skills to their peers. The role of trainer may put the manager in an unwelcomed position of being an expert in communication. One manager admitted that telling others how to behave interpersonally bothered him. "I am not an expert," he revealed, "I don't know anymore about the training skills than others and I feel uncomfortable telling them how to behave and act interpersonally." Another manager discovered that one of the students in his class was once his boss. "That was a real burden," he confessed, "I was worried about directing a critique."

Aside from teaching peers, other managers noticed that the goals of the training session sometimes conflicted with their role as manager. One manager mentioned that the training program would be more effective if it was held

outside the company at a hotel. But, as a manager he was concerned "about budget." Another admitted that the time away from the office was hard for him to justify. "I was uncomfortable with being away for three days. I am an employment manager. My productivity is measured by how many people I place, and what am I doing in a training program?"

Potential problems with training occurred when the role of trainer conflicted with the role of manager. At these times, the dedicated trainer could provide a real contribution to the training program. Trainers can retain the integrity of the program. Our experience with using both managers and dedicated trainers helps us to focus on the qualities we need to effectively train people in IMS. We need the credibility that managers bring with them. We also need the integrity that dedicated trainers contribute. In the next section of the paper we discuss ways that Lockheed's Train-the-Trainer program attempts to develop these qualities in the IMS trainers.

TRAINING THE TRAINER

In the last two sections of this paper we have made observations about communications skills and the role of trainers within Lockheed that raise a number of questions about training trainers. In the first section we acknowledge that certain communication skills were important. But equally important was the packaging of the program. The structure of the IMS program seemed to minimize the need for skilled trainers. In the second section we

discussed the contributions trainers and managers can make in a structured program like IMS. Again, the structure reduced the need for expertise in communication. We discovered that the most important contributions made by trainers in IMS were centered around enhancing the programs credibility. What can these conclusions tell us about preparing people to train in industry? What skills do prospective IMS trainers need to be effective trainers?

We found that the communication skills of listening, facilitation, and group discussion were not an important part of our IMS Train-the-Trainer day. Not that we thought of communication skills as unimportant. We are both good teachers, in part, because of our communication skills. But reluctantly we realized that some of what makes trainers effective can be packaged. Since the structure of the IMS program reduced our need to teach communication skills perse, we turned our attention to other functions that a Train the Trainer program might serve.

The Train-the-Trainer session became less an opportunity for people to learn and practice skills and more of an organizational rite of passage. It was the second phase of a three step process through which managers and dedicated trainers become certified IMS trainers. As mentioned earlier, managers contributed credibility to the program by virtue of their role in the organization. Again, who instructed was equally or more, important than how they trained. To ensure that the managers selected were credible, reputable, and in some way committed to the IMS program, we instituted a selection process so that managers were nominated to become trainers only after they

completed an IMS seminar. After the Train-the-Trainer they are asked to conduct one seminar, accompanied with an experienced trainer, before they officially become certified IMS trainers.

Once these issues of eligibility, selection, and quality control were addressed, the day long IMS Train-the-Trainer workshop became an initiation rite. We became less concerned about skills and more concerned about helping managers make the transition from manager participant to manager trainer. The train the trainer program constituted an organizational performance that allowed managers to learn the role and ropes of industry training.[4] We taught managers about the training role by helping them see what trainers do in IMS, why the IMS program runs as it does, and how it can best be administered. We taught managers about the training ropes by giving them time to practice the administration of the program and, as we mentioned, having them co-instruct the program with a "certified" instructor.

Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo indicate that there are two types of "performances" that teach people new organizational roles: orientation and initiation. Both were evident in the Train the Trainer session at Lockheed. "Orientation performances are those formal performances by which newcomers learn the what, how, and why of job behavior."[5] Managers spend two hours prior to their training day getting oriented to the training program. During that orientation, managers were given presentations by dedicated trainers and by representatives from Xerox Learning Systems. These presentations covered: 1) the history and research behind IMS; 2) the role of the IMS instructor, 3)

the contents of the administration manual and kit, and 4) how to prepare for the Train-the-Trainer day. The participants were also given reading materials that explained further the guidelines and procedures for IMS instructors.

As mentioned, another way people learn new organizational roles is by initiation. Initiations are opportunities for newcomers to emonstrate their new found knowledge and to display their commitment to the role.[6] During the training, the managers were initiated into the role of trainer by first presenting an IMS kickoff, and then answering "how to handle" situations.

The kickoff is a thirty minute presentation in which the trainer orients participants to the IMS program on the first day. It is basically an overview of IMS: what the skills are, how it is taught, the research behind the skills and so on. A major portion of the Train-the-Trainer day is devoted to giving participants opportunities to present their kickoff. Part of the value of the kickoff is that it gives people practice in their presentational skills. But equally important is the fact that in the kickoff managers must publicize their understanding of and commitment to the IMS program.

Another initiation performance managers experienced was the "how to handle" situations. While managers were practicing the IMS administration by walking through the Administration Manual, the Train-the-Trainer instructors posed questions and complaints that participants might present. Managers were expected to answer these questions and mollify the complainers. These questions and complaints would often give managers opportunities to practice

communication skills such as listening and managing differences. But they were more valuable as opportunities for managers to test the range of their knowledge about the training role. After hearing the manager's response, less time was spent discussing the communication skill used by the manager and more time was spent on clarifying their role responsibilities. The orientation and initiation activities prepared them for the training situations they may face in which their role as managers would conflict with their role as trainers.

Another value of the Train-the-Trainer seminar was that it gave managers opportunities to learn the training ropes. The bulk of the Train-the-Trainer day was spent practicing. Managers practiced the kickoff speeches and practiced administering one of the learning modules. This practice was seen as one of the most valuable parts of the Train-the-Trainer program. Consider some of the comments managers made:

> Spend more time going through the routines in the Train-the-Trainer.

> Practice with the tapes helped me prepare.

> Certainly the practice in the Train-the-Trainer session was important, but there was not enough.

> The most important part of the Train-the-Trainer session is to review the Administration Manual, then practice.

Practice helped them use some of their communication skills; it also helped demystify the trainer role. The administrative responsibilities in IMS at first glance would challenge even the most seasoned training veteran. An IMS trainer one must coordinate video dramas, audio recordings, follow instructions from the teaching manual, keep track of which "beeps," direct the teacher to the next portion of the program, and so on. To the participant it may appear hopelessly complicated. But to the trainer on the other side of the table, it is simplified by a well organized structure. Therefore, part of the Train-the-Trainer session is devoted to demystifying its administration. During the training session, managers were teamed and asked to present one full learning module. The goal was to give each team an opportunity to walk through every step a trainer needs to run a three day program. By learning the ropes, the manager might be less concerned with how to be a good teacher. It is this ability to be enthusiastic, share examples from their working environment, and demonstrate commitment to the IMS skills -- in effect be themselves -- that allows manager trainers to be so successful as IMS instructors.

To summarize, during the Train-the-Trainer day, managers are oriented to the trainer role and they have opportunities to learn the ropes about administering the program. As we reflect back over the program we realize that very little time is spent teaching people communication skills. In some ways we assume that the people selected into the program already have the basic communication skills necessary to teach. We also recognize that the IMS program has structured the needed communication skills into the program

itself. The advantage we see in teaching managers the role and ropes of training is that they focus less on trying to be an expert communication trainer and more on being comfortable as a manager doing training.

NOTES

1 Christopher H. Spicer, "Identifying the Communication Specialist: Implications for Career Education," COMMUNICATION EDUCATION, 28 (1979), 188.

2 Patricia A. McLagan and David Bedrick, "Models for Excellence: The Results of the ASTD Training and Development Competency Study," TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT JOURNAL, 37, No. 6 (1983), p. 14.

3 "Corporate Training, Program Status and Course Descriptions," ROLM CORPORATION, September (1981), p. 1.

4 Michael E. Pacanowsky and Nick O'Donnell-Trujillo, "Organizational Communication as Cultural Performance," COMMUNICATION MONOGRAPHS, 50 (1983), p. 144.

5 Pacanowsky, et al.

6 Pacanowsky, et al.